

## Session 7

---

### **Holistic Disaster Recovery: Creating a More Sustainable Future**

**Shared Governance**

**Time: 3 hours**

---

**(Slide 7-1)**

**Objectives:**

- 7.1 Discuss exam**
  - 7.2 Discuss shared governance using the horizontal and vertical integration typology**
  - 7.3 Conduct case study analysis and class presentation**
- 

**Scope:**

Following a discussion of the take home exam, the concept of shared governance of will be discussed using the horizontal and vertical integration typology. The concepts of vertical and horizontal integration refined by Uphoff (1986) and applied to disaster recovery by Berke, Kartez and Wenger (1993) and May and Williams (1986) provide a good framework to explain how intergovernmental relationships can affect disaster recovery at the local, state and federal level.

First, the concepts of vertical and horizontal integration will be discussed. Next, the concepts will be applied to circumstances present in the post-disaster environment. Finally, case studies will be used to help describe inter-organizational relationships and the degree to which they impact recovery efforts. Emphasis will be placed on how the level of integration affected the degree of conflict and consensus during disaster recovery across stakeholder groups.

---

**Readings:*****Student Readings:***

- Berke, Phillip, R., Jack Kartez, and Dennis Wenger. 1993. "Recovery After Disasters: Achieving Sustainable Development, Mitigation and Equity." *The Journal of Disaster Studies and Management*. Vol. 17, No. 2 Pp.93-109.
- May, Peter and W. Williams. 1986. Chapter 1 Disaster Policy in Perspective. Pp. 1-17. Chapter 2. Intergovernmental Implementation. Pp. 21-34. In *Disaster Policy Implementation: Strategies under Shared Governance*. Plenum Press: New York.
- May, Peter and Robert Deyle. 1998. Governing Land Use in Hazardous Areas with a Patchwork System. Pp. 57-84. In *Cooperating with Nature: Confronting Natural Hazards with Land-Use Planning for Sustainable Communities*. Raymond Burby, Editor.
- May, Peter J., Raymond J. Burby, Neil J. Erickson, John W. Handmer, Jennifer E. Dixon, Sarah Michaels, and D. Ingle Smith. 1996. *Environmental Management and Governance: Intergovernmental Approaches to Hazards and Sustainability*. Routledge: New York.

***Instructor Reading:***

- May, Peter and W. Williams. 1986. Chapter 4. Case Study Design. Pp. 49-62. Chapter 11 Implementation Research Revisited. Pp.171-181. In *Disaster Policy Implementation: Strategies under Shared Governance*. Plenum Press: New York.

(Slide 7-2)

## 7.1 Discuss exam

### Remarks:

The instructor should discuss the results of the exam by going over the key points to each question and answering questions posed by students. The review should serve to reinforce the topics discussed up to this point in the course. The instructor may choose to reiterate how the exams were evaluated and the requirements provided to students in the previous session.<sup>1</sup>

### The exam questions are listed below:

- Critique the current emergency management system, including the degree to which existing programs, policies and roles, facilitate sustainable disaster recovery. Your answer should include specific dimensions of disaster recovery discussed in Session III and how each may facilitate or hinder the process. Where appropriate, provide suggested improvements that will maximize sustainable recovery.
- Discuss how the new roles being adopted by emergency managers (discussed in Session 6) can be used to encourage sustainable recovery. Provide specific examples. Describe at least one example where new roles may hinder sustainable recovery.
- Discuss the major impacts of disasters, including physical, economic, environmental, psychological and social effects. Explain how the factors represent not only negative outcomes but also opportunities for positive change. Your answer should emphasize specific sustainable recovery themes.
- What do you believe to be the primary impediment to holistic disaster recovery and why? Explain your answer using specific examples discussed in class.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Student Instructions:* Students were required to answer question number one and two of the three remaining questions. Answers were to emphasize materials covered in the class lectures and assigned readings. Answers should be typed and double spaced, in order to ease the review of each answer and provide space for instructor comments.

---

## **7.2                    Discuss shared governance using the horizontal and vertical integration typology**

### **Remarks:**

Understanding recovery processes requires analyzing the concept of shared governance. The concepts of vertical and horizontal integration provide a sound framework to explain these relationships (May and Williams 1986, Berke, Kartez and Wenger 1993).

**(Slide 7-3 and 7-4)**

**Horizontal integration is characterized by the following traits:**

- **The existence of solid relationships across local groups, organizations and institutions. These may include:**
  - Community groups;
  - Non-profits; and
  - Local government agencies.

**(Slide 7-5)**

- A community with strong horizontal integration regularly facilitates policy dialogue and negotiation across local organizations.
  - This capacity is critical when identifying local needs and innovative solutions to the array of problems commonly faced in the post-disaster environment.
    - The identification of needs and proposed actions is a key step towards a comprehensive and sustainable recovery.
- A horizontally integrated community is more capable of implementing desired measures due to high levels of cooperation.

**(Slide 7-6)**

- A community with poor horizontal integration is usually unable to develop a meaningful vision of recovery that is based on stakeholder input.
  - The failure to include those that are interested in public policy decision making can lead to feelings of resentment and further fragmentation.
  - This downward spiral can be evidenced among the disenfranchised that feel as if they are inequitably represented by their local government officials.
  - The resulting backlash can cause elected officials to spend valuable time trying to make amends which limits the time spent on other disaster-related duties.
  - Failing to include all relevant experts or decision makers can limit the creative search for solutions that can occur during the disaster recovery process.

**(Slide 7-7)**

**Vertical integration is characterized by the following traits:**

- A strong connection to organizations and social networks outside of local institutions.
- Vertical integration can greatly enhance the ability of local governments to achieve desired aims, and to identify new or innovative solutions to complex problems.
- Positive linkages to outside organizations can also result in an enhanced power base. The ability to obtain federal state and local resources, for example, can be shaped by an organizations access to power.
- Weak vertical integration can result in an inability to influence federal, state and local decisions such as the immediate allocation of resources during the response and recovery effort or the prioritization of state actions.
  - This can prove particularly important when trying to identify potential aid programs, influence local, state and federal decision making or the attempt to procure post-disaster supplemental grant funding, should it be available.

(Slide 7-8, Slide 7-9, Slide 7-10 and Slide 7-11)

### **Vertical and Horizontal Integration Typology**

The horizontal and vertical integration typology provides a sound means to describe the capability of organizations to facilitate and effective and sustainable recovery.

- Communities that maintain both strong horizontal and vertical integration are referred to as **Type I communities**. Type I communities are more likely to recovery more quickly and to a greater degree than those that do not possess this dual nature (Berke, Kartez and Wenger 1993).
- **Type II communities** maintain strong horizontal integration and weak vertical integration. Examples include small, tight knit rural communities that do not posses a strong relationship with state and federal agencies.
  - As a result of their limited understanding of state and federal recovery programs and policies, many are dependent on the state to provide significant guidance.
  - Of those that are not identified following disasters as needing help or those who do not actively seek assistance, local recovery options are significantly limited.
- **Type III communities** possess weak horizontal integration and strong vertical integration. Connections to state and federal agencies responsible for providing assistance during a federally declared disaster can help.
  - Without a community vision that comes from meaningful public participation and the identification of local needs, recovery efforts are not optimized.
- **Type IV communities** are characterized by weak horizontal and weak vertical integration. Not surprisingly, these communities are the least equipped to face the duties associated with disaster recovery. Ineffective or limited institutional frameworks have been established both within and external to the community. Thus, a Type IV community can neither effectively seek outside aid nor coordinate internal actions necessary to implement recovery programs.

---

**Objective 7.3****Case Study Exercise: Analysis and Class Presentation**

(Slide 7-12)

**Remarks:**

The concept of vertical and horizontal integration can be applied to local, state and federal stakeholder groups discussed in previous sessions. For example, the level of horizontal integration found between local and state or state and federal agencies can significantly affect the ability of local governments, states and FEMA to guide recovery efforts. For example, the provision of federal funding alone does not guarantee a successful recovery. In fact, most emergencies and disasters are localized events that do not result in federal assistance. More importantly, an effective recovery requires the ability to coordinate across state and federal agencies in order to creatively maximize the use of existing programs, each of which may address a narrow group of stakeholders. This is particularly true when attempting to affect a sustainable recovery.

**Case Study Exercise**

The purpose of the case study exercise is to apply the concepts of vertical and horizontal integration to actual events where information exists about the type of recovery processes experienced in a given community. Specific tasks associated with the exercise include:

- The instructor should choose from the following case studies listed below (or identify others) and ask students to assess the degree to which horizontal and vertical integration exists.<sup>2</sup>

***Case Studies:***

Flood Case Study: Arnold Missouri. Jim Schwab. Pp. 217-228. In *Planning for Post Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction*. 1998. Schwab, et. al.

Hurricane Case Study: Opal in the Florida Panhandle. Richard Smith and Robert Deyle. Pp. 235-259. In *Planning for Post Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction*. 1998. Schwab, et. al.

Wildfire Case Study: Oakland California. Kenneth Topping. Pp.261-280. In *Planning for Post Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction*. 1998. Schwab, et. al.

---

<sup>2</sup> **Supplemental consideration:** The instructor may choose to identify and discuss a case study where a limited degree of horizontal and vertical integration exists. This example could be used to contrast outcomes with those achieved in those communities that possessed a high degree of vertical and horizontal integration.

Earthquake Case Study: Loma Prieta in Santa Cruz and Watsonville, California. Pp.281-310. In *Planning for Post Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction*. 1998. Schwab, et. al.

- This exercise is intended to be done in-class.<sup>3</sup>
- The instructor should assign case studies to teams that are comprised of not more than five individuals.
- Teams should be given 30 minutes to read the case study.
- An additional hour should be allotted to identify evidence of vertical and horizontal integration, summarize their findings on a flip chart and prepare to present what they observed.
- Each group should be given 10-15 minutes to present their findings. The four-cell typology discussed above should be used to characterize inter-organizational relationships.

**(Slide 7-13)**

- **Presentations should include the following elements:**
  - Teams should characterize the level of horizontal and vertical integration observed, including their effect on specific outcomes.
  - Strengths and weaknesses in inter-organizational coordination should be described.
  - Teams should explicitly specify what could be done to strengthen inter-organizational coordination, both vertically and horizontally, based on the information obtained from lectures and assigned readings.
  - Students should summarize how vertical and horizontal integration may impact other topics discussed up to this point in the course that were not addressed in the case study provided by the instructor.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The instructor may require students to conduct a more rigorous analysis, write up their findings and present the results during the next course session.

<sup>4</sup> Students may refer to the course outline for assistance.



**In order to characterize each case study within the four cell typology, students should identify examples of the characteristics listed below:**

**(Slide 7-14)**

***Horizontal Integration***

- Clear linkages across organizations, including formal and informal groups;
- Degree to which clear communication channels have been established;
- Degree to which negotiation and policy dialogue is present as a means to resolve disputes and solve problems; and
- Evidence of innovative solutions to complex problems.

**(Slide 7-15)**

***Vertical Integration***

- Evidence of regular communication between local government officials, state officials and FEMA;
- Evidence of a strong power base at the local level; and
- Demonstrated understanding of state and federal recovery rules and regulations.

**(Slide 7-16)**

**Additional presentation requirements include:**

- Once each group has completed their presentation, the case studies should be compared by students to determine commonalities and differences.
- Similarities and differences should be analyzed in the context of resulting outcomes. Examples of outcomes may include the effective, or ineffective, procurement and implementation of grant funds, achieving, or failing to achieve, multiple objectives, innovation, etc.

(Slide 7-17)

### **Class Discussion**

Following the completion of student presentations, the instructor should lead a class discussion addressing the relationship of horizontal and vertical integration. **The discussion should include the following topics:**

- Discuss how horizontal and vertical integration facilitates sustainable recovery;
- Discuss how horizontal and vertical integration may facilitate taking advantage of post-disaster opportunities;
- Discuss the relationship between the degree of horizontal and vertical integration identified and taking a short versus long-term perspective regarding disaster recovery;

(Slide 7-18)

- **Discuss the level of horizontal and vertical integration found across the following stakeholder groups and how this affected their roles in recovery:**
  - Federal, State, and Local Government Agencies and Officials;
  - Citizens;
  - Media;
  - Businesses and Corporations;
  - University and Research Institutions;
  - Non-profit Agencies and Volunteers and Emergent Community or Regional-level Organizations;
  - Contractors; and
  - Associations and Collaborative Partnerships.
- Discuss how a high degree of horizontal and vertical integration affects the implementation of recovery programs; and
- Discuss how changing roles may affect the degree of horizontal and vertical integration post-disaster.

(Slide 7-19)

### **Alternative Exercise: Class Paper**

The instructor should require students to analyze one of the four disaster policies presented in the text: *Disaster Policy Implementation: Managing Programs Under Shared Governance* (May and Williams 1986). **Specific disaster policies include:**

- Floodplain Management (Chapter 5);
- Dam Safety (Chapter 6);
- Earthquake Preparedness (Chapter 7); and
- Crisis Relocation Planning (Chapter 8).

Students should be instructed to write a brief paper, not to exceed ten pages in length, in which each student compares and contrasts the findings of May and Williams with the most recent literature describing the program under review. **The paper should include:**

- A brief discussion of May and Williams' findings;
- A descriptive analysis of the program's current status (based on a review of the literature); and
- A defensible hypothesis describing how and why the current disaster policy differs from that assessed by May and Williams in 1986.

Students are expected to support their hypotheses with relevant literature, particularly that assigned as part of the course. Papers should be turned in two weeks following the assignment. The instructor may require students to present their findings to the class and field questions.

---

## References

- Berke, Phillip, R., Jack Kartez, and Dennis Wenger. 1993. "Recovery After Disasters: Achieving Sustainable Development, Mitigation and Equity." *The Journal of Disaster Studies and Management*. Vol. 17, No. 2 Pp.93-109.
- May, Peter and W. Williams. 1986. *Disaster Policy Implementation: Strategies Under Shared Governance*. Plenum Press: New York.
- Uphoff, Norman. 1986. *Local Institutional Development: An Analytical Sourcebook*. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.